## **TREND Statement Checklist**

| Paper<br>Section/Topic | Item | Descriptor  | Reported? |     |  |  |
|------------------------|------|---|-----------|-----|--|--|
|                        | No.  |   | <b>✓</b>  | Pg# |  |  |
| TITLE and ABSTRACT     |      |   |           |     |  |  |
| Title and Abstract     | 1    | Information on how units were allocated to interventions  |           | 2   |  |  |
|                        |      | Structured abstract recommended   |           | 2   |  |  |
|                        |      | Information on target population or study sample  |           | 2   |  |  |
| NTRODUCTION            |      |   |           |     |  |  |
| Background             | 2    | Scientific background and explanation of rationale  |           | 3   |  |  |
|                        |      | Theories used in designing behavioral interventions   |           | NA  |  |  |
| METHODS                |      |   |           |     |  |  |
| Participants           | 3    | Eligibility criteria for participants, including criteria at different levels in recruitment/sampling plan (e.g., cities, clinics, subjects)  | √         | 3-4 |  |  |
|                        |      | Method of recruitment (e.g., referral, self-selection), including the sampling method if a systematic sampling plan was implemented   | √         | 3-4 |  |  |
|                        |      | Recruitment setting   |           | 3-4 |  |  |
|                        |      | Settings and locations where the data were collected  |           | 3-4 |  |  |
| Interventions          | 4    | Details of the interventions intended for each study condition and how and when they were actually administered, specifically including:  | 1         | 4   |  |  |
|                        |      | o Content: what was given?  |           | 4   |  |  |
|                        |      | Delivery method: how was the content given?   |           | NA  |  |  |
|                        |      | Unit of delivery: how were subjects grouped during delivery?  |           | NA  |  |  |
|                        |      | Deliverer: who delivered the intervention?  |           | NA  |  |  |
|                        |      | Setting: where was the intervention delivered?  |           | NA  |  |  |
|                        |      | <ul> <li>Exposure quantity and duration: how many sessions or episodes or events were intended to be delivered?</li> <li>How long were they intended to last?</li> </ul>  | ,         | NA  |  |  |
|                        |      | Time span: how long was it intended to take to deliver the intervention to each unit?   | 1         | 4   |  |  |
|                        |      | Activities to increase compliance or adherence (e.g., incentives)   |           | NA  |  |  |
| Objectives             | 5    | Specific objectives and hypotheses  | √         | 4   |  |  |
| Outcomes               | 6    | Clearly defined primary and secondary outcome measures  |           | 4   |  |  |
|                        |      | Methods used to collect data and any methods used to enhance the quality of measurements  |           | 4   |  |  |
|                        |      | Information on validated instruments such as psychometric and biometric properties  |           | 4   |  |  |
| Sample size            | 7    | How sample size was determined and, when applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping rules   | 1         | 4   |  |  |
| Assignment             | 8    | Unit of assignment (the unit being assigned to study condition, e.g., individual, group, community)   |           | 4   |  |  |
| method                 |      | Method used to assign units to study conditions, including details of any restriction (e.g., blocking, stratification, minimization)  | { `- ·    | NA  |  |  |
|                        |      | <ul> <li>Inclusion of aspects employed to help minimize potential bias induced due to non-randomization (e.g.,<br/>matching)</li> </ul>   |           | NA  |  |  |
| Blinding (masking)     | 9    | Whether or not participants, those administering the interventions, and those assessing the outcomes were<br>blinded to study condition assignment; if so, statement regarding how the blinding was accomplished and how<br>it was assessed |           | NA  |  |  |
| Unit of Analysis       | 10   | Description of the smallest unit that is being analysed to assess intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community)  | 1         | 4   |  |  |
|                        |      | <ul> <li>If the unit of analysis differs from the unit of assignment, the analytical method used to account for this (e.g.,<br/>adjusting the standard error estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)</li> </ul>        |           | NA  |  |  |
| Statistical<br>methods | 11   | Statistical methods used to compare study groups for primary methods outcome(s), including complex methods for correlated data  | 1         | 5   |  |  |
|                        |      | Statistical methods used for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analysis   |           | 5   |  |  |
|                        |      | Methods for imputing missing data, if used  | ]         | NA  |  |  |

## **TREND Statement Checklist**

|                         |    | Statistical software or programs used  | 1  | 5     |
|-------------------------|----|--|----|-------|
| RESULTS                 |    |  |    |       |
| Participant flow        | 12 | Flow of participants through each stage of the study: enrollment, assignment, allocation and intervention exposure, follow-up, analysis (a diagram is strongly recommended)  | V  | 6-8   |
|                         |    | <ul> <li>Enrollment: the numbers of participants screened for eligibility, found to be eligible or not eligible, declined<br/>to be enrolled, and enrolled in the study</li> </ul>   | V  | 6-8   |
|                         |    | Assignment: the numbers of participants assigned to a study condition  |    | 6-8   |
|                         |    | <ul> <li>Allocation and intervention exposure: the number of participants assigned to each study condition and the<br/>number of participants who received each intervention</li> </ul>  |    | NA    |
|                         |    | <ul> <li>Follow-up: the number of participants who completed the follow-up or did not complete the follow-up (i.e.,<br/>lost to follow-up), by study condition</li> </ul>  |    | NA    |
|                         |    | Analysis: the number of participants included in or excluded from the main analysis, by study condition  |    | 6-8   |
|                         |    | Description of protocol deviations from study as planned, along with reasons   |    | NA    |
| Recruitment             | 13 | Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up  | √  | 6     |
| Baseline data           | 14 | Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of participants in each study condition  | √  | 6-8   |
|                         |    | Baseline characteristics for each study condition relevant to specific disease prevention research   |    | 6-8   |
|                         |    | Baseline comparisons of those lost to follow-up and those retained, overall and by study condition   |    | 6-8   |
|                         |    | Comparison between study population at baseline and target population of interest  |    | 6-8   |
| Baseline equivalence    | 15 | Data on study group equivalence at baseline and statistical methods used to control for baseline differences   |    | 7     |
| Numbers<br>analyzed     | 16 | Number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis for each study condition, particularly when the denominators change for different outcomes; statement of the results in absolute numbers when feasible  |    | 6     |
|                         |    | Indication of whether the analysis strategy was "intention to treat" or, if not, description of how non-compliers were treated in the analyses   |    | NA    |
| Outcomes and estimation | 17 | For each primary and secondary outcome, a summary of results for each estimation study condition, and the estimated effect size and a confidence interval to indicate the precision  | 1  | 6-8   |
|                         |    | Inclusion of null and negative findings  |    | 6-8   |
|                         |    | Inclusion of results from testing pre-specified causal pathways through which the intervention was intended to operate, if any   |    | NA    |
| Ancillary analyses      | 18 | Summary of other analyses performed, including subgroup or restricted analyses, indicating which are prespecified or exploratory   | 1  | 7-8   |
| Adverse events          | 19 | Summary of all important adverse events or unintended effects in each study condition (including summary measures, effect size estimates, and confidence intervals)  |    | NA    |
| DISCUSSION              |    |  |    |       |
| Interpretation          | 20 | Interpretation of the results, taking into account study hypotheses, sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study   | V  | 10-12 |
|                         |    | Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work     (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations   | √  | 10-12 |
|                         |    | Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation   | √. | 12    |
|                         |    | Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications   |    | NA    |
| Generalizability        | 21 | Generalizability (external validity) of the trial findings, taking into account the study population, the characteristics of the intervention, length of follow-up, incentives, compliance rates, specific sites/settings involved in the study, and other contextual issues | √  | 11-12 |
| Overall evidence        | 22 | General interpretation of the results in the context of current evidence and current theory  |    | 12    |
|                         | 1  |  | 1  |       |

From: Des Jarlais, D. C., Lyles, C., Crepaz, N., & the Trend Group (2004). Improving the reporting quality of nonrandomized evaluations of behavioral and public health interventions: The TREND statement. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94, 361-366. For more information, visit: <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/">http://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/</a>